	Case 1:23-cv-00973-NODJ-GSA Doo	cument 17 Filed 12/12/23 Page 1 of 3	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	CHARLENE STITH,	Case No.: 1:23-cv-00947-NODJ-GSA	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER RELATING AND REASSIGNING CASES	
13	V.		
14 15	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,  Defendants.		
16	Defendants.		
17	VICTORIA GREEN,	Old Case No.: 1:23-cv-00973-JLT-EPG New Case No. 1:23-cv-00973-NODJ-GSA	
18	Plaintiff,	The Woulder Thomas Control of Con	
19	V.		
20	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,		
21	Defendants.	Case No.: 1:23-cv-00974-NODJ-GSA	
22	TREMAINE CARROLL,	(Unchanged)	
23	Plaintiff, v.		
24	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,		
25	Defendants.		
26			
27			
28			

## Case 1:23-cv-00973-NODJ-GSA Document 17 Filed 12/12/23 Page 2 of 3

1	JONATHAN ROBERTSON,	Old Case No.: 1:23-cv-00975-NODJ-SAB
2	Plaintiff,	New Case No. 1:23-cv-00975-NODJ-GSA
3	V.	
4	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	
5	Defendants.	
6	FANCY MOORE LIPSEY,	Old Case No.: 1:23-cv-00976-NODJ-SAB
7	Plaintiff,	New Case No. 1:23-cv-00976-NODJ-GSA
8	V.	
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	
10	Defendants.	
11	RAYSHAWN HART,	Old Case No.: 1:23-cv-00977-JLT-BAM
12	Plaintiff,	New Case No. 1:23-cv-00977-NODJ-GSA
13	v.	
14	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16	CRYSTAL GRAHAM,	Old Case No.: 1:23-cv-01323-JLT-BAM
17	Plaintiff,	New Case No. 1:23-cv-01323-NODJ-GSA
18	V.	
19	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	
20	Defendants.	
21	ROXANNE PURDAGONE,	Old Case No.: 1:23-cv-01324-NODJ-SKO
22	Plaintiff,	New Case No. 1:23-cv-01324-NODJ-GSA
23	v.	
24	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	
25	Defendants.	
26		finds the shore continued estions one related. A

Pursuant to Local Rule 123, the Court finds the above-captioned actions are related. A review of the complaints in these cases shows they are related within the meaning of Local Rule

27

28

## Case 1:23-cv-00973-NODJ-GSA Document 17 Filed 12/12/23 Page 3 of 3

1	123(a), as they involve overlapping or similar parties and claims, related questions of fact or law,		
2	and would likely entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges. Accordingly,		
3	assignment of the actions to the same district judge and magistrate judge will promote		
4	convenience, efficiency, and economy for the Court and the parties. An order relating cases		
5	under this Court's Local Rule 123 merely assigns them to the same district judge and magistrate		
6	judge and does not consolidate the cases. Under Rule 123, related cases are generally assigned to		
7	the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was assigned. Local Rule 123(c)		
8	provides that "the Chief Judge or a Judge designated by the Chief Judge may, by special order,		
9	reassign either action to any Judge or Magistrate Judge sitting in the Eastern District of California		
10	as the situation may dictate."		
11	Good cause appearing, this Court finds the above-captioned cases are related and		
12	<b>ORDERS</b> that the following actions be reassigned to No District Judge and United States		
13	Magistrate Judge Gary S. Austin. Going forward, all documents filed shall bear the following new		
14	case numbers:		
15	Green v. State of California, et al., Case No. 23-cv-00973-NODJ-GSA		
16	Robertson v. State of California, et al., Case No. 23-cv-00975-NODJ-GSA		
17	Lipsey v. State of California, et al., Case No. 23-cv-00976-NODJ-GSA		
18	Hart v. State of California, et al., Case No. 23-cv-00977-NODJ-GSA		
19	Graham v. State of California, et al., Case No. 23-cv-01323-NODJ-GSA		

Graham v. State of California, et al., Case No. 23-cv-01323-NODJ-GSA

Purdagone v. State of California, et al., Case No. 23-cv-01324-NODJ-GSA

It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court make appropriate adjustment in the assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 11, 2023.

25

26

20

21

22

23

24

27

28